DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 057 767 JC 710 262

AUTHOR Hill, Malcolm D.; And Others
TITLE Faculty Readiness for Innovation: A Case Study.
INSTITUTION Harrisburg Area Community Coll., Pa.
REPORT NO RR-9
PUB DATE 71
NOTE 61p.
AVAILABLE FROM Harrisburg Area Community College, 3300 Cameron Street Road, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17110 ($2.00)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS College Faculty; *Educational Development; *Instructional Innovation; *Junior Colleges; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Characteristics

ABSTRACT

This study of facutlty readiness for innovative goals and practices measured and evaluated faculty acceptance of non-traditional institutional practices believed necessary to meet community and student learning needs. Two objectives were: (1) to develop a profile of attitudes toward conditions suggesting departure from tradition and readiness for innovation; and (2) to identify faculty characteristics related to flexibility and acceptance of innovation. Results were anticipated to be of administrative benefit in: (1) recruiting faculty members with professional expectations consistent with the mission of the community college; (2) planning and implementing programs for in-service development of existing faculty; and (3) developing strategies for introducing innovation in programs, services, and institutional structure. (Author/AL)

ED057767

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FACULTY READINESS FOR INNOVATION: A CASE STUDY

Malcolm D. Hill
Doctoral Student
Pennsylvania State University

Fred A. Snyder
Director
Research and Community Resources

Clyde E. Blocker
President

JC 710 262

RESEARCH REPORT NO. 9

Harrisburg Area Community College
3300 Cameron Street Road
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17110

Copyright, Harrisburg Area Community College, 1971
Price: $2.00

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Harrisburg Area Community College, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

DEC 30 1971

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

RESEARCH REPORTS AT H.A.C.C.

#1. A Profile of Students. 1969, $2.00. ERIC document ED 037 203.

#2. A Profile of Graduates. 1969, $2.00 ERIC document ED 037 204.

#3. A Profile of Non-Persisting Students. 1970, $2.00. ERIC document ED 037 218.

#4. 1966 Transfer Student Performance. 1970, $1.50. ERIC document ED 040 698.

#5. Persistence of Developmental Students. 1970, $2.00. ERIC document ED 042 438.

#6. The Adult Student Population. 1971, $2.00. ERIC document ED 047 689.

#7. The Employment of Career Graduates. In process.

#8. Community Attitudes Toward the Community College. 1971, $2.00 ERIC document ED 049 762.

#9. Faculty Readiness for Innovation: A Case Study. 1971, $2.00.

#10. Financial Aids for Community College Students. 1971, $2.00.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

It is not a simple matter to explore the feelings of a group of educators about their work, especially when they are colleagues. One might expect a faculty to become defensive about their feelings, especially during this period of unrest which is marked by pressure from students, legislators, and the general public. The cooperation of the faculty at Harrisburg Area Community College with this study is an indication of their professional openness. The authors are sincerely grateful to them.

CONTENTS

Section	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iv
INTRODUCTION	1
The Purpose	1
Population for the Study	2
Collection and Treatment of the Data	3
Limitations of the Study	4
DESCRIPTION OF FACULTY	5
Demographic Background	5
Professional Background	5
Professional Activities	7
FACULTY ATTITUDES	9
Student Behavior and Role	10
Administration and Policy	12
Educational Programs and Services	13
Faculty Role	14
Instructional Research	14
Summary of Findings	15
RECOMMENDATIONS	19
REFERENCES	22
APPENDIX	23
Presentation of Data	24
Tables	25

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Age Distribution	25
2.	Marital Status	26
3.	Sex Distribution	27
4.	Place of Residence Prior to Employment at H.A.C.C.	28
5.	Educational Level Completed by Faculty	29
6.	Region of College at Which Highest Degree Was Earned	30
7.	Father's Educational Level	31
8.	Father's Occupational Level	32
9.	Professional Activity Immediately Prior to Employment at H.A.C.C.	33
10.	Areas of Previous Teaching Experience	34
11.	Number of Years Teaching Experience	35
12.	Year of Completion of Most Recent Graduate Course in Same Field	36
13.	Completion of Graduate-Level Course Primarily Related to the Junior College	37
14.	Academic Rank Distribution	38
15.	Number of Studies or Papers Completed in Teaching or Educational Field	39
16.	Number of Projects for Developing New Courses or Programs	40
17.	Frequency of Using Various Teaching Techniques During Professional Career	41
18.	Areas of Community Participation Since 1967	42
19.	Number of Journal Subscriptions	43
20.	Number of Professional Organization Memberships	44

LIST OF TABLES
(continued)

Table		Page
21.	All Things Considered, Student Dissent on College Campuses Has Served a Constructive Function for Both Students and Faculty	45
22.	The Only Limitations on Student Dress Should Be Those Specifically Related to Matters of Hygiene and Safety.	46
23.	Students Should Be Encouraged to Participate on Virtually All College Committees	47
24.	All Things Being Equal, College Administrators Are in the Best Possible Position to Make Decisions About College Policy	48
25.	The Present Method of Evaluating Student Performance Through Letter or Numerical Grades is Probably the Best One Currently Available	49
26.	With Respect to Special Student Services for Disadvantaged Students, the Administration Should Seek Out Such Students Within the Community, Even if Money and Programs Must Be Specially Sought to Meet the Need	50
27.	The College Should Provide Community Leadership in Such Areas of Social Change as Civil Rights, Housing, Equal Employment, and Social Services	51
28.	Non-Degree Programs in Continuing Education Should Be Expanded to Meet the Desires of the Community	52
29.	The Goals of Education for Community College Students Should Focus Primarily Upon Preparation for Employment and American Culture and Traditions	53
30.	The Role of the Instructor at the Community College Should Include Research and Development About the Techniques and Outcomes of Teaching	54
31.	There is Adequate Professional Support (Released Time, Professional Consultation, Etc.) for Instructional Research at H.A.C.C.	55
32.	Nothing in My Past Education or Experience Prepared Me for Instructional Research as Noted in Tables 30 and 31	56

During recent years much has been published regarding innovation in educational practices and policies at institutions of higher education. Some studies have focused on aspects of faculty and instruction within the two-year college, including improvement of teaching (Johnson, 1964, 1970), concerns of the faculty (Garrison, 1967), backgrounds and preparation of faculty (Kelly and Connolly, 1970), and faculty characteristics (Brawer, 1968). Relatively little attention has been directed toward empirical evaluation of faculty attitudes about specific issues which face the two-year college. This study represented an attempt to bridge this gap by examining faculty attitudes toward innovation within the two-year college.

Growing numbers of students who would not have enrolled in traditional college programs have been attending community colleges, and this trend is expected to continue in the 1970's. But, even with the vast expansion of the community college movement, there have been limited attempts to develop uniquely-appropriate educational practices (Johnson, 1964; Brawer, 1968). Nevertheless, some authorities feel the community college may offer great potential for innovation, that it is still in the state of development where experimentation with imaginative programs and techniques can be tried and evaluated (Cohen, 1969; Johnson, 1964; Cosand, 1968). Experienced observers agree that a basic condition of innovation in education ultimately rests with the willingness and ability of faculty to accept and implement change (Roueche, Baker, and Brownell, 1971, p. 16).

The Purpose

This study was undertaken to explore the readiness of the faculty for innovative goals and practices at one community college. It attempted to measure and evaluate faculty acceptance of institutional practices which are non-traditional, but generally believed to be necessary in a college attempting to meet effectively community and student learning needs. Two objectives of the study were: (1) to develop a profile of attitudes toward conditions which suggest departure from tradition and a readiness for innovation; and (2) to identify those faculty characteristics which are related to flexibility and acceptance of innovation. The writers believe the study can lead to further understanding of a number of administrative concerns, including recruiting faculty members with professional expectations consistent with the mission of the community college; planning and implementing programs for in-service development of existing faculty; and developing strategies for introducing innovation in programs, services, and institutional structure.

For a number of reasons, a case study of the faculty at Harrisburg Area Community College (H.A.C.C.) seemed appropriate for an evaluation of innovation within the community college: H.A.C.C. is the oldest public community college in Pennsylvania and is noted for its general maturity and quality by the regional Middle States accrediting agency and by the community it serves. Its faculty and programs represent several diverse areas usually contained in a comprehensive community college. The administration has supported a number of new approaches to improving the quality of the College's programs, and several of the College's practices have received national attention.[1] Still, the writers viewed the College as operating essentially from traditional precepts and practices, and they believed that the faculty must be encouraged further to respond to unmet educational needs in the community. This study was designed to learn how better to provide such encouragement.

Population for the Study

During the Fall 1970 semester, there were 143 full-time faculty at H.A.C.C. who held the rank of instructor or higher. For this study these were located in eight institutional categories: five academic divisions, a division of student personnel services, a division of instructional resources, and the administration. The tabulation which follows shows the distribution of the population and extent of participation in this study.

	Number on staff	Number participating
Administrators	8	8
Student personnel services	8	8
Business & management services	14	14
Communications & the arts	35	35
Life sciences, health services, and physical education	15	15
Social science and public services	29	27
Mathematics, physical science, and engineering	28	26
Instructional resources	6	6
Total	143	139

Administrators included those persons who held the title of dean, associate dean, assistant dean, and several other staff persons who were not identifiable in other categories. The student personnel group

---

[1] An outstanding example of an effective programmed learning system has been in operation for several years (Ferencz, 1970). Substantial amounts have been budgeted for activities related to professional development of faculty. Also, the College maintains an institutional research program with a full-time staff to conduct institutional studies and assist with instructional development projects.

contained counselors and personnel workers in admissions, records, and financial aids. Not included were two student personnel deans and several counselors who were assigned to academic divisions. Division counselors at H.A.C.C. hold dual instructional-guidance roles and have a line relationship to division chairmen. Division counselors and division chairmen were assigned to those academic divisions in which they worked. The instructional resources group included librarians and one multi-media specialist.

Collection and Treatment of the Data

During the faculty orientation session which preceded the opening of the Fall 1970 semester, each faculty member received a copy of the questionnaire from which all data for this study were obtained. A copy of a brief statement from the president of the College, noting endorsement of the study and urging participation, was attached to the questionnaire. Respondents were told not to sign their names to the questionnaire and were assured that the data would be used exclusively for this study and not for any administrative evaluation of individuals.

Only four faculty members declined to participate in the study. Due to the conditions under which the data were collected, many faculty members may have felt obligated to participate regardless of their personal inclinations. Thus, the response rate was considerably higher than it might have been had the questionnaire been mailed to individuals.

The data included three types of information: demographic characteristics of the faculty, educational and related professional activities, and responses to an attitude scale of the Likert type which included 12 statements about 5 areas of educational concern: student behavior and role, administration and policy, educational programs and services, faculty role, and instructional research.

Findings regarding demographic, educational, and professional background were summarized. Responses to the 12 statements of the attitude scale were examined modally, and relationships between the background variables and faculty attitudes were explored. Interpretation of the findings and their implications for innovation at the College were noted. The data analyses were basically descriptive; however, as a general guide to the analyses, some inferential statistics were computed to measure the relationships between faculty attitudes and background characteristics. Chi square was computed for the distribution of responses for each item across each of seven background variables.

The reliability of the questionnaire was not fully established, but intercorrelations of responses to the 12 statements of the attitude scale

were low, showing general independence among the statements; most intercorrelations were under 0.30, and just one was as high as 0.40.

Limitations of the Study

It was noted earlier that the respondent may have felt compelled to answer the questionnaire because of the conditions under which it was presented. Also, because much specific personal information was collected, the respondent may have felt that his responses easily could be identified with him. Together, these conditions may have led to eliciting "acceptable" responses from at least some faculty members.

The research instrument has not been used elsewhere, so there is no existing norm against which to compare the findings. Finally, it must be remembered that this is a case study at one community college at a given point in time. Replication of the study is needed to determine if the research instrument would produce comparable results at other institutions.

Despite these recognized limitations, the writers believe that the basic objectives of the study were fulfilled. While recognizing the need for precision in social research, this need should not outweigh the need for information necessary to a better understanding of institutional problems which exist both locally and nationally.

Description of Faculty

This description includes information about demographic, educational, and parental background of the faculty and, also, a brief profile of their professional experiences. Most table references are shown in parentheses, and tables are located in the Appendix.

Demographic Background

The faculty at Harrisburg Area Community College was predominately young. One-third were under 30, two-thirds were under 40, and only one in six was 50 or over (Table 1). Four-fifths were married (Table 2), and seven-tenths were men (Table 3). Sixty percent had been residents of Pennsylvania prior to accepting a position with the College (Table 4). Seven-tenths had earned a master's degree, and an additional one-tenth had received advanced graduate specialist training or earned a doctoral degree (Table 5). Over half obtained their graduate education either in Pennsylvania or other Middle Atlantic states, indicating that a majority were employed from Pennsylvania or adjacent states.

Some interesting patterns emerged with respect to the parental backgrounds of faculty. The educational level of faculty members differed markedly from that of their fathers. Two-thirds of all faculty members' fathers completed a high school education or less (Table 7). To an extent, this difference reflects the general upgrading in educational achievement which has occurred over past decades. Also, these data, along with information about father's occupational category, suggest that the faculty at H.A.C.C. is, in sociological terms, very upwardly-mobile. Nearly half of the fathers of the faculty had occupations which were in low or moderate status categories of clerical, farm owner or operator, semiskilled or unskilled, service, or skilled worker, rather than in higher status occupations (Table 8). Sociologists have repeatedly noted that teaching in public schools is an area which offers opportunities for upward social mobility to youth from lower and lower-middle socio-economic categories. This same drive for upward mobility was apparent among the faculty at H.A.C.C.

Professional Background

The faculty were drawn from various educational and professional backgrounds (Table 9). The areas of professional activity engaged in by faculty members just prior to their coming to H.A.C.C. are summarized following this paragraph. One-fourth were recruited directly from graduate school. Nearly half had taught just previously at either basic education schools, two-year colleges, or four-year colleges. One-tenth

came directly from work in business or industry. Earlier studies have noted that community college faculties included significant numbers of former high school teachers (Kelly and Connolly, 1970; Johnson, 1964). To some extent this is true at H.A.C.C.

Professional activity	Percent
Attended graduate school	25
Taught in basic education	21
Taught in four-year college	17
Employed in business or industry	11
Taught in two-year college	9
Served in armed forces	1
Other	16
Total	100

The types of prior teaching experiences by a faculty may be important in affecting professional attitudes. A brief summary of these cumulative experiences is shown at the end of this paragraph and is reported in more detail in Table 10. Totals exceed 100 percent, as many persons noted more than one category of experience.

Areas of teaching	Percent
Basic education	57
Four-year college or university	32
Other two-year colleges	22
Teaching as a graduate assistant	19
None	19

Overall, the faculty reported short-term to moderate teaching experience, considering their cumulative experiences at all institutions. Nearly half had five years or less experience, and just one-fifth taught for 15 years or more (Table 11). The development of the community college movement is relatively new in the East, and many faculty members at the community college may be entering the teaching profession at this level.

A majority of the H.A.C.C. faculty, seven-tenths, completed some graduate study during the five-year period preceeding the study (Table 12). However, just one-sixth had completed one or more graduate courses dealing specifically with the two-year college (Table 13). This undoubtedly reflects the fact that, until recently, few graduate departments of universities offered such courses. Still, a lack of formal preparation for the unique role of the community college must be viewed as a major limitation in staff preparation. With this limitation, it should not be surprising if the staff use as a professional reference point either secondary schools or four-year institutions.

The respondents were distributed by academic rank as follows: three-tenths as instructor, four-tenths as assistant professor, and one-tenth each as associate professor and professor (Table 14).

Professional Activities

As previously stated, one objective was to identify faculty characteristics which may be related to flexibility and acceptance of innovation. Accordingly, this study focused on those activities which might reflect innovative tendencies.

It has been generally agreed that the primary emphasis for the faculty role in the two-year college is on teaching rather than research or publications. One might expect only the more highly-motivated and innovative among two-year faculty members to have produced studies or publications. It is not surprising, therefore, to find that nearly 40 percent of the faculty completed no professional publications and that an additional 30 percent completed only one (Table 15). On the other hand, 10 percent reported completing five or more papers. These findings, showing that a minority of faculty emerge as the major producers of professional publications, are probably common to most two- and four-year colleges.

Another measure of innovative tendency is the extent of faculty involvement in developing new courses or educational programs. Nearly 30 percent had not participated in any such projects, and an additional one-fifth reported participation in only one (Table 16). A small minority emerged as major contributors; one-seventh reported five or more projects. Even considering the fact that many faculty members in this study had limited teaching experience, these findings suggest that a significantly large proportion see their role as confined primarily to a teaching function rather than including program development and evaluation.

A further measure of innovative tendency is the extent and variety of teaching methods reported to have been used during the course of normal teaching duties (Table 17). A majority reported the use of teaching hardware, software, visiting lecturers and field trips; and one-third reported having used a team-teaching approach. Although these data suggest extensive use of several instructional procedures, it is not known how frequently individuals relied upon them. Also, because different courses and programs generally require different procedures, the meaning of these findings about teaching methods is not clear.

It is hoped that community college faculty are broadly aware of community-centered educational needs. A measure of such awareness may be inferred from the extent to which faculty are involved in community

participation. The findings suggest that faculty are relatively active in the community and indicate some alertness to the needs of the community (Table 18). Almost half reported involvement in community action projects, including fund-raising, civic improvement, and political activity. Between one-fourth and one-sixth reported activity in each of the following: professional consulting, appointed or elected office, and other unnamed activities.

The writers believe that the extent of journal subscriptions and professional memberships held by a faculty are generally valid criteria for professional awareness and readiness for innovation. Nine-tenths of the faculty reported receiving one or more journals (Table 19); and eight-tenths reported membership in one or more professional organizations, with nearly 60 percent reporting membership in two or more (Table 20).

Briefly, this description of the H.A.C.C. faculty can be summarized as follows: (1) a majority had prior teaching experience, usually at the basic education level; (2) only a small minority had a formal introduction to the community college as part of their graduate training; (3) a small minority were very involved in program development or in professional writing; and (4) most were active in some type of community affairs.

Faculty Attitudes

A major concern of this study was to examine the extent of faculty readiness for professional innovation. To obtain the necessary information, the writers developed a set of 12 items which included 5 areas of concern to the community college educator. Individuals were asked to respond to each item by checking the one of five responses which best represented their opinion, as follows: strongly agree, mildly agree, neutral, mildly disagree, and strongly disagree. For the first 10 items, responses could be viewed as a continuum ranging from "acceptance of innovation" to "orientation to traditionalism." The last two items provided information about faculty feelings toward their backgrounds for and College support for instructional research.

Items and their respective categories were as follows:

Student behavior and role.

a. All things considered, student dissent on college campuses has served a constructive function for both students and faculty.

b. The only limitations on student dress should be those specifically related to matters of hygiene and safety.

c. Students should be encouraged to participate on virtually all college committees.

Administration and policy.

d. All things being equal, college administrators are in the best possible position to make decisions about college policy.

e. The present method of evaluating student performance through letter or numerical grades is probably the best one currently available.

Educational programs and services.

f. With respect to special services for disadvantaged students, the administration should seek out such students within the community, even if money and programs must be specially sought to meet the need.

g. The college should provide community leadership in such areas of social change as civil rights, housing, equal employment, and social services.

h. Non-degree programs in continuing education should be expanded to meet the desires of the community.

i. The goals of education for community college students should focus primarily upon preparation for employment and American cultures and traditions.

Faculty role.

j. The role of the instructor at the community college should include research and development about the techniques and outcomes of teaching.

Instructional research.

k. There is adequate professional support (released time, professional consultation, etc.) for instructional research at H.A.C.C.

l. Nothing in my past education prepared me for instructional research as noted in (j) and (k).

Analyses of the responses to each of the 12 statements were conducted to locate differences between faculty groups, for each of the following descriptive variables: divisional affiliation, age, previous residence, completion of a graduate course on the junior college, educational level, academic rank, and number of years teaching experience. To assist with these analyses, a chi-square computation was completed for the distribution of responses to each statement, successively for the seven descriptive variables. In all, 84 computations were completed. Because the response data were obtained from an entire faculty population, the probability value of .20 or less for chi-square served only as a guide for examining closely for group differences a given data tabulation.

A discussion of the responses to the 12 statements follows. Tables 21 through 32, located in the Appendix, each contain complete data for responses to one statement.

Student Behavior and Role

Statements which related to three aspects of student behavior and role were included: student dissent, dress, and participation on college committees. Responses were analysed to assess the extent of faculty acceptance of change in student behavior and role.

Student dissent. Overall, two-thirds of the faculty agreed (mildly or strongly) that student dissent has served a constructive function. Differences were found between faculty groups by divisional affiliation, academic rank, and previous residence (Table 21).

Student services personnel and faculty in social sciences and public services were most in agreement, followed by faculty in communications

and the arts. Student services personnel are probably closest to the student "pulse"and in many ways may be more sympathetic to student opinion. College faculty in social sciences and the arts have long been identified with various "liberal" viewpoints; and since student dissent of the past decade has been overwhelmingly associated with liberal causes, the pattern of responses of these groups is to be expected.

One-half of the administrative group reported neutral feelings concerning student dissent. As a college administration serves to bridge the community-at-large and the campus, it may be expected to steer a largely middle course between the idealism of students and the traditionalism of the community.

The most "conservative" faculty response came from the mathematics, physical sciences, and engineering (MAPSE) division. Although the reasons are not clear, it may be that faculty in the physical and applied science disciplines, at least at the two-year college level, tend to adhere to the more established values of society.

Proportionally more persons who moved into Pennsylvania to work at the College agreed with the statement on student dissent than those whose previous residence was in Pennsylvania.

There were pronounced differences by academic rank in faculty responses. Instructors viewed student dissent as considerably more positive than did higher ranking faculty.

Student dress. Seven-tenths of the faculty agreed that the only limitations on student dress should be those specifically related to matters of hygiene and safety. Differences between faculty groups were found by divisional affiliation, age, and educational level (Table 22).

Among divisional groups, the social sciences and public services, communications and the arts, and life sciences led in agreeing with the statement (80 percent or more). At the other end of the continuum, instructional resources, business and management services, student personnel services, and MAPSE disagreed most (from 50 to 35 percent). This pattern of responses is similar to that for student dissent, in that the social sciences and arts faculty were the most "liberal." It differs in that, while on the issue of student dissent student services personnel were the most liberal, they were among the more conservative groups on the issue of dress.

When viewed according to age, faculty under 40 years and 50 or over were more accepting or tolerant of liberal attitudes toward student dress. Considering educational level, those holding lower level degrees such as a bachelor's or less were most conservative toward student dress, while those with higher degrees were most accepting.

Participation on committees. Two-thirds of the faculty agreed, either strongly or mildly, that students should be encouraged to participate on virtually all college committees. Differences between faculty groups were found by divisional affiliation, age, whether a course in the two-year college was completed, and years teaching experience (Table 23).

Among divisional groups, social sciences and public services were most in agreement (86 percent), followed by administrators and the student services personnel. Instructional resources staff were least in agreement (33 percent). Among age groups, the under-30 faculty were most in agreement, followed by those of age 50 or over. Those who completed a course on the junior college were more in agreement than those who did not, and those who taught for five years or less were more in agreement than those who taught for a longer period.

Administration and Policy

Two statements were included which related to decisions about college policy and evaluation of student academic performance. Responses were analysed to assess the extent of faculty acceptance of traditional authority and practice as against a desire to depart from traditional modes. Departure from traditional modes was assumed by the writers to be indicative of innovative tendencies.

Decisions about college policy. The faculty were evenly-divided in feeling that administrators are in the best possible position to make decisions about college policy. Differences in responses were found by divisional affiliation, whether the respondent completed a graduate course related to the two-year college, educational level, and academic rank (Table 24). Disagreement was assumed to imply that this authority should be shared with the faculty, students, and other groups.

Among academic divisions, communications and the arts, and social sciences and public services disagreed most. The youngest faculty members, those under 30 years of age, disagreed more than the older members. Twice the proportion of those who had completed a graduate course related to the two-year college disagreed, as compared to those who had not completed such a course. The higher the educational achievement, the greater was the tendency to disagree with the statement. However, those with higher academic rank tended most to agree, showing a different relationship with educational level than with academic rank.

Grading system. In response to the statement that the present letter or numerical system is probably the best currently available, twice as many faculty agreed as disagreed. Acceptance of current letter grading systems was assumed to indicate a general acceptance of traditional

teaching and evaluation modes for the community college setting. Differences in responses were found by divisional affiliation, age, previous residence, and whether a graduate course in the two-year college was completed (Table 25).

Social science and public services faculty were outstanding in their disagreement; they were the only divisional group which disagreed with the statement. Other faculty groups who disagreed most were those under age 30, those who moved into Pennsylvania, and those who completed a graduate course related to the two-year college.

Educational Programs and Services

Statements were included which related to four aspects of educational programs and services at the community college: special services for disadvantaged students; leadership in civil rights and social action; continuing education; and educational goals of the community college. Responses favoring expansion of such programs and services were viewed as an indication of innovative tendencies.

Services for disadvantaged students. The faculty overwhelmingly agreed that the administration should seek out disadvantaged students within the community, even if money and programs must be specially sought to meet the need (Table 26). Four-fifths agreed, and only one-tenth disagreed. Differences among groups were minor.

Leadership in civil rights and social action. Two-thirds of the faculty agreed that the College should provide community leadership in such areas of social change as civil rights, housing, equal employment, and social services. Differences among groups were found by divisional affiliation, previous residence, academic rank, and years teaching experience; these differences usually were not striking (Table 27).

Among divisional groups, the communications and arts faculty indicated most intense agreement. Opinions of administrators ranged from mild agreement (three-fourths) to neutral, and student services personnel were evenly-divided in their opinions. Faculty who moved into Pennsylvania to work at H.A.C.C. were far more in agreement than were faculty whose previous residence was in-state or local. Differences among academic rankings were not clear-cut, but instructors were more intense in their agreement than were higher-ranking faculty. Similarly, faculty who had taught for five years or less were more intense in their agreement.

Overall, responses revealed a moderately liberal faculty having a "social service" commitment.

Expanding continuing education. The faculty was of one mind in feeling that non-degree programs in continuing education should be expanded

to meet the desires of the community; 98 percent were in agreement (Table 28). Continuing education appears to be the area where readiness for expansion and innovation is strongest.

Educational goals for community college students. The purpose of this statement was to assess faculty opinion about whether a community college education should be directed toward preparation for employment and cultural assimilation, while essentially ignoring humanistic and self-fulfillment goals. Unfortunately, because the phrasing was viewed as vague and ambiguous, the responses cannot be interpreted with accuracy. The brief description of the responses must be viewed with caution.

Overall, two-thirds of the faculty agreed with the statement, and just one-fourth disagreed. Among divisional groups, student services personnel and social sciences and public services faculty disagreed most, implying a need for educational goals which were not stated (Table 29). Faculty who moved into Pennsylvania disagreed more often than Pennsylvania natives.

Faculty Role

Only one statement was included, which noted that the role of the instructor at the community college should include research and development about the techniques and outcomes of teaching. Overall, four-fifths of the faculty agreed, showing a general acceptance of an instructional role which goes beyond the traditional classroom activities. Only minor differences among groups were found (Table 30). Instructional resources staff and student services personnel (most of whom do not teach), and communications and arts faculty were somewhat more in agreement than were other groups. Younger faculty, and those with five years or less teaching experience, expressed somewhat stronger agreement than other groups.

Instructional Research

The last two statements in the attitude survey were related to support within the College for and personal preparation for instructional research. As such, the responses represent a measure of faculty readiness for innovation.

Support for instructional research. The statement that there is adequate support for instructional research at H.A.C.C. drew equally-divided responses from the faculty. A plurality of four-tenths were neutral (Table 31). Differences among groups were found by whether a graduate course in the two-year college was completed and by educational level. Those who completed a course related to the two-year college were

relatively more in disagreement than the others. Faculty with doctorates or advanced specialist degrees tended to be somewhat less in agreement with and more critical of the statement.

Personal preparation for instructional research. Less than three-tenths of the faculty agreed that nothing in their past experience prepared them for instructional research. Just over half disagreed, to indicate that their past experience included at least some preparation for instructional research (Table 32). It must be remembered that these responses cannot be equated with quality of preparation but, rather, with an expressed confidence in one's preparation. Differences among groups were found by divisional affiliation and completion of a graduate course related to the two-year college.

Among divisional groups, the social science and public services faculty felt more qualified, while the instructional resources staff and the administrators felt least prepared to undertake instructional research.

Overall, the faculty did not agree that there was adequate professional support--released time, professional consultation, etc.--for instructional research. At least half stated that they had had some preparation for instructional research, and this can be viewed as at least mild willingness to undertake practical developmental projects in instructional and learning systems. Since the time these data were collected (August, 1970) there has been significantly increased College support for faculty participation in such projects, and attitudes on this issue may have changed during the 1970-71 year.

Summary of Findings

A key construct for this study is the dimension of innovation versus traditionalism. While no abstract definition of this dimension is offered, the writers assumed that to be innovative the faculty must show an acceptance or preference for certain conditions or programs at the two-year college, which for the most part are markedly different from those at colleges such as the faculty attended (usually a decade or more ago). The instrument included statements about specific conditions related to student behavior and role, decision-making about college policy, the grading system, a variety of educationalservices to the community and to disadvantaged students, goals of education, faculty role, and applied instructional research. For each statement, "acceptance of innovation" was reflected from the respondents' preferences for those conditions or practices which have been gaining ascendancy only recently in higher education.

For example, it was considered as "innovative" for a respondent to agree that student dissent has been constructive, students should serve

on college committees, the college should attempt to attract and support disadvantaged students, non-degree programs should be expanded, and the instructor's role should include instructional research and development. It was considered as "traditional" for a respondent to disagree with the foregoing points and for him to agree that past grading practices have been the best evaluative method available, and that administrators are in the best position to decide about college policy.

Responses to the two statements about support for instructional research were not rated on the innovative versus traditional dimension; rather, they were considered as either favorable or unfavorable conditions for instructional research.

Viewing the first ten statements in the attitude scale as relating to readiness for innovation, it is clear that attitudes are more supportive of innovation in some areas than in others. The tabulation which follows shows the items of the attitude scale listed in rank order of faculty acceptance of innovation.

Generally, the faculty revealed tolerant or liberal views about student behavior and role. Regarding administration and policy, they were more conservative. Under half disagreed that college administrators are in the best position to decide on college policy, and even fewer disagreed that the present grading system (letter or numerical grades) is probably the best available.

Their views about educational programs and services appeared mixed, but faculty were generally supportive of change. They were nearly unanimous in support of expanding continuing education programs, and they gave heavy support to providing special services for disadvantaged students and to providing community leadership for civil rights and social action. The majority accepted a "conservative" statement about educational goals, but the statement was admittedly vague and open to interpretation.

An overwhelming majority agreed that the instructor's role should include research and development related to techniques and outcomes of teaching. However, just half indicated that their past experience prepared them for such a role, and only a minority agreed that the College provided adequate professional support for instructional research.

Group differences. The major source of differences was revealed when responses were grouped by divisional affiliation. The social sciences and public services faculty were often the most liberal or accepting of innovative practices, followed by the communications and arts faculty and student services personnel. Younger faculty members appeared generally more accepting of innovation. In some respects, other groups were more accepting of innovation, including those who moved into Pennsylvania to take employment at H.A.C.C., those who completed a graduate course related to the two-year college, those with advanced degrees, and those with fewer years teaching experience.

Faculty Readiness for Innovative Goals and Practices
Summary of Responses to Statements on Attitude Scale

	Percent of Responses	
	Acceptance of Innovation	Orientation to Traditionalism
Non-degree programs in continuing education should be expanded to meet the desires of the community.	98 (agree)	1
The role of the instructor at the community college should include research and development about the techniques and outcomes of teaching (Item J).	79 (agree)	9
With respect to special services to disadvantaged students, the administration should seek out such students within the community even if money and programs must be specially sought to meet the need.	79 (agree)	9
The only limitations on student dress should be those specifically related to matters of hygiene and safety.	70 (agree)	22
The college should provide community leadership in such areas of social change as civil rights, housing, equal employment, and social services.	68 (agree)	18
Students should be encouraged to participate on virtually all college committees.	68 (agree)	21
All things considered, student dissent on college campuses has served a constructive function for both students and faculty.	66 (agree)	22
All things being equal, college administrators are in the best possible position to make decisions about college policy.	42 (disagree)	42
The present method of evaluating student performance through letter or numerical grades is probably the best one currently available.	29 (disagree)	55
The goals of education for community college students should focus primarily upon preparation for employment and American culture and traditions.	23 (disagree)	65

Note.--The percentages result from the total number of responses from the two categories at the appropriate end of the five-point scale being divided by the total number of responses from all five categories.

Summary of Responses From Which Support For Instructional Research Was Inferred

	Percentages	
	Favorable Responses	Unfavorable Responses
Nothing in my past education or experience prepared me for instructional research as noted in Items J and K.	53 (disagree)	27
There is adequate professional support (released time, professional consultation, etc.) for instructional research at H.A.C.C. (Item K).	30 (agree)	28

Note.--Items J and K are both on page 10.

Recommendations

Although this study examined readiness for innovation as a desirable feature in a faculty group, the writers acknowledge that it is just one criterion of quality. Also, the writers do not mean to imply that most community college staff members should be in the vanguard of developing and evaluating innovative practices. Others have noted that a community college faculty should include persons with several roles and orientations. Blocker (1965) noted that the ideal faculty should include departmental specialists, generalists, and student-centered teachers. Kelly and Connolly (1970) recommended that the generalist-teacher in the community college be supported by a core of specialists in instructional methods and research, who would stimulate and support innovation. Still, it is hoped that most staff members would have some awareness of new approaches to educational practices, and some ability and desire to introduce them into their instructional and related activities.

With due regard for a balanced perspective of innovation among a community college faculty, several recommendations for enhancing their readiness for innovation are presented in the paragraphs which follow. It should be noted that these recommendations are not likely to reduce the diversity of faculty characteristics and activities. The writers do not envision the two-year faculty of the future as comprising a homogeneous group of practitioners whose philosophies, experiences, and goals for higher education are identical. Many differences will undoubtedly remain. However, the faculty should share a core of beliefs about the potential of the two-year college, and a general readiness to develop and implement specific educational programs in response to changing educational needs. The recommendations which follow are intended to enhance the development of more appropriate norms of beliefs and professional roles by faculty at two-year colleges.

1. Presidential leadership. A first prerequisite for developing an innovative faculty is a desire by the President to improve the quality of instruction at the community college, and an awareness of some approaches to improving it. The President, more than any other individual, sets the tone of the college through selection of deans, building an organizational structure, building the budget, setting personnel policy, and his performance of many other functions.

2. Selection of new personnel. Next to the appointment of the President, the selection of properly-qualified personnel for the college staff is most crucial to developing an innovative faculty. New personnel must have prior experiences, abilities, and attitudes which will allow them to develop their functions in terms of stated goals and objectives, rather than in terms of past behavioral models.

3. Faculty orientation programs. New staff members must be given an appropriate orientation to the college and its purpose. Kelly and Connolly (1970) have specified in considerable detail a rationale and a model for an orientation program for new faculty. Prior experiences of new community college personnel are diverse, and even those who have had graduate preparation in education usually have not been introduced to the uniqueness of the community college.

4. Continued professional development. Equally important as the orientation of new faculty is a program of continued professional development for all faculty members. New ideas about higher education, new developments in teaching and counseling, changes in the student body, changes in college objectives, and the desire for continued personal development by individual staff members all support the need for a well-planned program of staff development. Appropriate activities for such a program include attendance at professional conferences and workshops, on-campus and off-campus meetings and interchanges with recognized educational leaders and experts, formal graduate study, participation in study or implementation projects with specific objectives, appropriate field trips, and others. The relationships between readiness for innovation and completion of a graduate course related to the two-year college, as noted in this study, provide one illustration of the benefits of continued professional development.

5. System to reward effective performance. Normal faculty assignments often tend to diminish the possibility of effective participation in innovative activities. Typically, faculty members are expected to teach four or five class sections, serve as advisor to a number of students, maintain office hours for student contact, and attend committee meetings. Provided that they meet these obligations with some regularity and receive adequate evaluations from students and academic supervisors, faculty members continue to progress through the rank and tenure system. The would-be innovator has to do all this, and still find time for his developmental work.

   If faculty are to be actively involved in developing more effective educational practices, a system of rewards must exist which will acknowledge innovative or creative efforts. Such a system should contain psycho-social and economic components, including promotion in rank, forms of peer recognition, some personal freedom to select and carry out work activities (with a continued emphasis on instruction and student learning), and merit salary increases. Other incentives include travel to conferences and developmental centers, released time from

teaching and related duties to plan and implement specific projects, or additional compensation in lieu of released time, and encouragement to publish results of useful projects.

Faculty members should be encouraged, within reasonable limits, to offer their professional services to other colleges, research centers, and publishers. Such procedures do not mark an introduction into the "publish or perish" race; rather, they are necessary to the development of more effective educational programs and practices at the two-year college. While the two-year college must continue to depend upon universities and research centers for significant basic research and development, it must maintain its ability to apply research findings in a manner which is consistent with developing its unique educational mission.

6. Administrative and support services. Administrative and organizational support for new instructional practices is essential to encouraging innovative faculty activity. A systems approach to instruction that may require paraprofessional personnel, special equipment and software, and unique faculty-student interactions cannot be expected to meet all previously-developed standards of operation (many of which may be objectively irrelevant to the new system) and still meet appropriate objectives for performance and cost-benefits. An additional form of administrative support for faculty innovation is the provision of technical assistance in developing project proposals and writing evaluation reports.

REFERENCES

Blocker, C. E. Are our faculties competent? Junior College Journal, 1965, 36, 4, 12-17.

Brawer, F. B. Personality characteristics of college and university faculty: Implications for the community college. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1968.

Cohen, A. M. Dateline '79: Heretical concepts for the community college. Beverly Hills, Calif: Glencoe Press, 1969.

Cosand, J. The community college in 1980. In A. C. Uerich (Ed.), Campus 1980. New York: Delacorte Press, 1968. Pp. 134-148.

Ferencz, D. A programmed approach to the teaching of shorthand and typewriting. In B. L. Johnson (Ed.), The improvement of junior college instruction. Los Angeles: University of California, 1970. Pp. 63-68.

Garrison, R. H. Junior college faculty: Issues and problems. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967.

Johnson, B. L. Islands of innovation (Occasional Report Number 6). Los Angeles: University of California, Junior College Leadership Program, 1964.

Johnson, B. L. The improvement of junior college instruction (Occasional Report Number 15). Los Angeles: University of California, Junior College Leadership Program, 1970.

Kelly, M. F. and Connolly, J. Orientation for faculty in junior colleges. American Association of Junior Colleges Monograph Series, 1970, No. 10.

Roueche, J. E.; Baker, G. E.; and Brownell, R. L. Accountability and the community college. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1971.

APPENDIX

Presentation of Data

Use of Percentages

Percentages are used as a common transformation to facilitate comparisons between various categories. The reader should note the actual N upon which the percentage is based. Although some categories do have a small N, the entire population was surveyed, and there was a high rate of response.

Abbreviated Headings Used on Tables

Divisional Affiliation	Abbreviation
Business & Management Services	Bus. & Mgt Services
Communication and the Arts	Comm. & the Arts
Instructional Resources	Instruc. Resources
Life Sciences, Health Services, and Physical Education	Life Sciences
Mathematics, Physical Science, and Engineering	MAPSE
Social Science and Public Services	Soc. Sci. & Pub. Svcs.
Administration	Administration
Student Personnel Services	Stu. Pers. Services

TABLE I
AGE DISTRIBUTION

	Bus.& Mgt Services		Comm. & the Arts		Instruc. Resources		Life Sciences	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Up to 29	1	7.1	14	41.2	3	50.0	6	40.0
30 to 39	7	50.0	12	35.3	0	0	2	13.3
40 to 49	5	35.7	5	14.7	2	33.3	5	33.3
50 & over	1	7.1	3	8.8	1	16.7	2	13.3
Total	14	100.0	34	100.0	6	100.0	15	100.0

	MAPSE		Soc.Sci.& Pub.Svcs.		Adminis-tration		Stu.Pers. Services		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Up to 29	5	19.2	14	51.9	1	12.5	2	25.0	46	33.3
30 to 39	9	34.6	6	22.2	4	50.0	3	37.5	43	31.1
40 to 49	3	11.5	3	11.1	1	12.5	3	37.5	27	19.6
50 & over	9	34.6	4	14.8	2	25.0	0	0	22	15.9
Total	26	100.0	27	100.0	8	100.0	8	100.0	138	100.0

TABLE 2
MARITAL STATUS

	Bus.& Mgt Services		Comm. & the Arts		Instruc. Resources		Life Sciences	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Single	0	0	9	25.7	2	33.3	4	26.7
Married or other	14	100.0	26	74.3	4	66.7	11	73.3
Total	14	100.0	35	100.0	6	100.0	15	100.0

	MAPSE		Soc.Sci.& Pub.Svcs.		Adminis-tration		Stu.Pers. Services		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Single	3	11.5	7	25.9	1	12.5	1	12.5	27	19.4
Married or other	23	88.5	20	74.1	7	87.5	7	87.5	112	80.6
Total	26	100.0	27	100.0	8	100.0	8	100.0	139	100.0

TABLE 3
SEX DISTRIBUTION

	Bus.& Mgt Services		Comm. & the Arts		Instruc. Resources		Life Sciences	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Males	13	92.9	20	57.1	1	16.7	7	46.7
Females	1	7.1	15	42.9	5	83.3	8	53.3
Total	14	100.0	35	100.0	6	100.0	15	100.0

	MAPSE		Soc.Sci.& Pub.Svcs.		Adminis-tration		Stu.Pers. Services		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Males	22	84.6	23	85.2	8	100.0	7	87.5	101	72.7
Females	4	15.4	4	14.8	0	0	1	12.5	38	27.3
Total	26	100.0	27	100.0	8	100.0	8	100.0	139	100.0

TABLE 4
PLACE OF RESIDENCE PRIOR TO EMPLOYMENT AT H.A.C.C.

	Bus.& Mgt Services		Comm. & the Arts		Instruc. Resources		Life Sciences	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Moved into Penna. to take job at H.A.C.C.	7	50.0	16	45.7	2	33.3	9	60.0
Moved within Penna. to take job at H.A.C.C.	3	21.4	7	20.0	0	0	1	6.7
Did not change residence	4	28.6	12	34.3	4	66.7	5	33.3
Total	14	100.0	35	100.0	6	100.0	15	100.0

	MAPSE		Soc.Sci.& Pub.Svcs.		Adminis-tration		Stu.Pers. Services		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Moved into Penna. to take job at H.A.C.C.	2	7.7	13	48.1	5	62.5	1	12.5	55	39.6
Moved within Penna. to take job at H.A.C.C.	5	19.2	4	14.8	2	25.0	1	12.5	23	16.5
Did not change residence	19	73.1	10	37.0	1	12.5	6	75.0	61	43.9
Total	26	100.0	27	100.0	8	100.0	8	100.0	139	100.0

TABLE 5
EDUCATIONAL LEVEL COMPLETED BY FACULTY*

	Bus.& Mgt Services		Comm. & the Arts		Instruc. Resources		Life Sciences	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
High school graduate plus some formal technical or business training	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bachelor's degree	4	28.6	4	11.4	3	50.0	4	26.7
Master's degree	10	71.4	26	74.3	2	33.3	9	60.0
Advanced graduate specialist or doctorate	0	0	5	14.3	1	16.7	2	13.3
Total	14	100.0	35	100.0	6	100.0	15	100.0

	MAPSE		Soc.Sci.& Pub.Svcs.		Adminis-tration		Stu.Pers. Services		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
High school graduate plus some formal technical or business training	1	3.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.7
Bachelor's degree	4	15.4	2	7.4	1	12.5	2	25.0	24	17.3
Master's degree	21	80.8	20	74.1	5	62.5	5	62.5	98	70.5
Advanced graduate specialist or doctorate	0	0	5	18.5	2	25.0	1	12.5	16	11.5
Total	26	100.0	27	100.0	8	100.0	8	100.0	139	100.0

*No responses to items of "high school graduate" and "associate degree"

TABLE 6
REGION OF COLLEGE AT WHICH HIGHEST DEGREE WAS EARNED

	Bus.& Mgt Services		Comm. & the Arts		Instruc. Resources		Life Sciences	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
New England	0	0	1	2.9	0	0	2	13.3
Middle Atlantic (except Pa.)	1	7.1	10	28.6	1	16.7	5	33.3
Pennsylvania	11	78.6	14	40.0	1	16.7	4	26.7
Southern	0	0	5	14.3	2	33.3	1	6.7
Midwest	2	14.3	4	11.4	2	33.3	2	13.3
West	0	0	1	2.9	0	0	1	6.7
Total	14	100.0	35	100.0	6	100.0	15	100.0

	MAPSE		Soc.Sci.& Pub.Svcs.		Adminis-tration		Stu.Pers. Services		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
New England	1	4.0	0	0	1	12.5	1	12.5	6	4.3
Middle Atlantic (except Pa.)	4	16.0	4	14.8	0	0	1	12.5	26	18.8
Pennsylvania	11	44.0	9	33.3	0	0	0	0	50	36.2
Southern	4	16.0	3	11.1	2	25.0	4	50.0	21	15.2
Midwest	5	20.0	4	14.8	4	50.0	2	25.0	25	18.1
West	0	0	7	25.9	1	12.5	0	0	10	7.2
Total	25	100.0	27	100.0	8	100.0	8	100.0	138	100.0

TABLE 7
FATHER'S EDUCATIONAL LEVEL

	Bus.& Mgt Services		Comm. & the Arts		Instruc. Resources		Life Sciences	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Completed 8 grades or less	2	14.3	12	34.3	0	0	4	26.7
Attended high school	3	21.4	5	14.3	0	0	2	13.3
High school graduate	4	28.6	10	28.6	4	66.7	6	40.0
Attended college	3	21.4	3	8.6	2	33.3	2	13.3
Received bachelor's degree	1	7.1	3	8.6	0	0	0	0
Received master's or higher degree	1	7.1	2	5.7	0	0	1	6.7
Total	14	100.0	35	100.0	6	100.0	15	100.0

	MAPSE		Soc.Sci.& Pub.Svcs.		Adminis-tration		Stu.Pers. Services		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Completed 8 grades or less	5	20.0	8	29.6	4	50.0	4	50.0	39	28.3
Attended high school	5	20.0	5	18.5	1	12.5	1	12.5	22	15.9
High school graduate	2	8.0	3	11.1	0	0	1	12.5	30	21.7
Attended college	5	20.0	7	25.9	2	25.0	1	12.5	25	18.1
Received bachelor's degree	3	12.0	2	7.4	1	12.5	0	0	10	7.2
Received master's or higher degree	5	20.0	2	7.4	0	0	1	12.5	12	8.7
Total	25	100.0	27	100.0	8	100.0	8	100.0	138	100.0

TABLE 8
FATHER'S OCCUPATIONAL LEVEL

	Bus.& Mgt Services		Comm. & the Arts		Instruc. Resources		Life Sciences	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Clerical	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Farm owner or operator	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Managerial and office	3	21.4	8	22.9	1	16.7	3	20.0
Professional	1	7.1	6	17.1	1	16.7	4	26.4
Sales	1	7.1	6	17.1	1	16.7	0	0
Semiprofessional and technical	1	7.1	2	5.7	1	16.7	1	6.7
Semiskilled and unskilled	2	14.3	4	11.4	1	16.7	0	0
Service	0	0	2	5.7	0	0	1	6.7
Skilled	6	42.9	7	20.0	1	16.7	6	40.0
Total	14	100.0	35	100.0	6	100.0	15	100.0

	MAPSE		Soc.Sci.& Pub.Svcs.		Adminis-tration		Stu.Pers. Services		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Clerical	1	3.8	0	0	1	12.5	0	0	2	1.4
Farm owner or operator	1	3.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.7
Managerial and office	7	26.9	10	37.0	1	12.5	2	25.0	35	25.2
Professional	6	23.1	3	11.1	0	0	1	12.5	22	15.8
Sales	2	7.7	1	3.7	1	12.5	0	0	12	8.6
Semiprofessional and technical	1	3.8	2	7.4	0	0	0	0	8	5.8
Semiskilled and unskilled	2	7.7	0	0	1	12.5	2	25.0	12	8.6
Service	1	3.8	3	11.1	2	25.0	0	0	9	6.5
Skilled	5	19.2	8	29.6	2	25.0	3	37.5	38	27.3
Total	26	100.0	27	100.0	8	100.0	8	100.0	139	100.0

TABLE 9
PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY IMMEDIATELY PRIOR TO EMPLOYMENT AT H.A.C.C.

	Bus.& Mgt Services		Comm. & the Arts		Instruc. Resources		Life Sciences	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Attended graduate school	3	21.4	13	37.1	2	33.3	3	20.0
Taught in basic education	3	21.4	8	22.9	1	16.7	3	20.0
Taught in four-year college or university	1	7.1	8	22.9	0	0	4	26.7
Taught in two-year college	2	14.3	3	8.6	0	0	1	6.7
Employed in business or industry	5	35.7	1	2.9	0	0	0	0
Served in armed forces	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	2	5.7	3	50.0	4	26.7
None	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	14	100.0	35	100.0	6	100.0	15	100.0

	MAPSE		Soc.Sci.& Pub.Svcs.		Adminis-tration		Stu.Pers. Services		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Attended graduate school	4	15.4	7	25.9	2	25.0	1	12.5	34	24.6
Taught in basic education	8	30.8	3	11.1	1	12.5	2	25.0	29	21.0
Taught in four-year college or university	5	19.2	5	18.5	0	0	0	0	23	16.7
Taught in two-year college	3	11.5	3	11.1	1	12.5	0	0	13	9.4
Employed in business or industry	6	23.1	1	3.7	1	12.5	1	12.5	15	10.9
Served in armed forces	0	0	1	3.7	0	0	0	0	1	.7
Other	0	0	7	25.9	3	37.5	3	37.5	22	15.9
None	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	12.5	1	.7
Total	26	100.0	27	100.0	8	100.0	8	100.0	138	100.0

TABLE 10
AREAS OF PREVIOUS TEACHING EXPERIENCE

	Bus.& Mgt Services (N=14)		Comm. & the Arts (N=35)		Instruc. Resources (N=6)		Life Sciences (N=15)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Elementary or secondary school, public	8	57.1	19	54.3	4	66.7	4	26.7
Elementary or secondary school, non-public	0	0	8	22.9	0	0	0	0
Two-yr. college, other than H.A.C.C.	5	35.7	6	17.1	0	0	3	20.0
Four-yr. college or university	4	28.6	13	37.1	0	0	5	33.3
Graduate assistant (teaching) at university	4	28.6	11	31.4	0	0	3	20.0
None	3	21.4	4	11.4	2	33.3	3	20.0

	MAPSE (N=26)		Soc.Sci.& Pub.Svcs. (N=27)		Adminis-tration (N=8)		Stu.Pers. Services (N=8)		Total (N=139)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Elementary or secondary school, public	14	53.8	6	22.2	6	75.0	3	37.5	64	46.0
Elementary or secondary school, non-public	3	11.5	3	11.1	0	0	1	12.5	15	10.8
Two-yr. college, other than H.A.C.C.	4	15.4	8	29.6	3	37.5	1	12.5	30	21.6
Four-yr. college or university	7	26.9	10	37.0	4	50.0	1	12.5	44	31.7
Graduate assistant (teaching) at university	5	19.2	6	22.2	2	25.0	0	0	26	18.7
None	4	15.4	6	22.2	1	12.5	3	37.5	26	18.7

TABLE 11
NUMBER OF YEARS TEACHING EXPERIENCE *

	Bus.& Mgt Services		Comm. & the Arts		Instruc. Resources		Life Sciences	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Less than 5	7	50.0	13	37.1	2	33.3	9	60.0
6 to 14	3	21.4	16	45.7	4	66.7	3	20.0
15 or more	4	28.6	6	17.1	0	0	3	20.0
Total	14	100.0	35	100.0	6	100.0	15	100.0

	MAPSE		Soc.Sci.& Pub.Svcs.		Adminis-tration		Stu.Pers. Services		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Less than 5	9	34.6	17	62.9	2	25.0	4	50.0	63	45.3
6 to 14	12	46.2	7	25.9	4	50.0	2	25.0	51	36.7
15 or more	5	19.2	3	11.1	2	25.0	2	25.0	25	18.0
Total	26	100.0	27	100.0	8	100.0	8	100.0	139	100.0

*Teaching at any level, basic through higher education

TABLE 12
YEAR OF COMPLETION OF MOST RECENT GRADUATE COURSE IN SAME FIELD

	Bus.& Mgt Services		Comm. & the Arts		Instruc. Resources		Life Sciences	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1965 or before	2	14.3	8	22.9	3	50.0	4	26.7
1966 to 1970	10	71.4	25	71.4	2	33.3	10	66.7
None	2	14.3	2	5.7	1	16.7	1	6.7
Total	14	100.0	35	100.0	6	100.0	15	100.0

	MAPSE		Soc.Sci.& Pub.Svcs.		Adminis-tration		Stu.Pers. Services		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1965 or before	8	30.8	4	14.8	3	37.5	1	12.5	33	23.7
1966 to 1970	15	57.7	23	85.2	4	50.0	7	87.5	96	69.1
None	3	11.5	0	0	1	12.5	0	0	10	7.2
Total	26	100.0	27	100.0	8	100.0	8	100.0	139	100.0

TABLE 13
COMPLETION OF GRADUATE-LEVEL COURSE
PRIMARILY RELATED TO THE JUNIOR COLLEGE

	Bus.& Mgt Services		Comm. & the Arts		Instruc. Resources		Life Sciences	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	5	38.5	6	17.6	1	16.7	2	13.3
No	8	61.5	28	82.4	5	83.3	13	86.7
Total	13	100.0	34	100.0	6	100.0	15	100.0

	MAPSE		Soc.Sci.& Pub.Svcs.		Adminis-tration		Stu.Pers. Services		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	2	7.7	3	11.1	1	12.5	3	37.5	23	16.8
No	24	92.3	24	88.9	7	87.5	5	62.5	114	83.2
Total	26	100.0	27	100.0	8	100.0	8	100.0	137	100.0

TABLE 14
ACADEMIC RANK DISTRIBUTION

	Bus.& Mgt Services		Comm. & the Arts		Instruc. Resources		Life Sciences	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Instructor	2	14.3	17	48.6	2	33.3	6	40.0
Assistant professor	9	64.3	11	31.4	3	50.0	5	33.3
Associate professor	1	7.1	5	14.3	0	0	3	20.0
Professor	2	14.3	2	5.7	1	16.7	1	6.7
Total	14	100.0	35	100.0	6	100.0	15	100.0

	MAPSE		Soc.Sci.& Pub.Svcs.		Adminis-tration		Stu.Pers. Services		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Instructor	5	19.2	11	40.7	0	0	3	37.5	46	33.1
Assistant professor	13	50.0	12	44.4	3	37.5	4	50.0	60	43.2
Associate professor	4	15.4	3	11.1	1	12.5	1	12.5	18	12.9
Professor	4	15.4	1	3.7	4	50.0	0	0	15	10.8
Total	26	100.0	27	100.0	8	100.0	8	100.0	139	100.0

TABLE 15
NUMBER OF STUDIES OR PAPERS COMPLETED IN TEACHING OR EDUCATIONAL FIELD

	Bus.& Mgt Services		Comm. & the Arts		Instruc. Resources		Life Sciences	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	5	35.7	13	37.1	5	83.3	5	33.3
One	5	35.7	10	28.6	0	0	4	26.7
Two to four	2	14.3	9	25.7	1	16.7	3	20.0
Five or more	2	14.3	3	8.6	0	0	3	20.0
Total	14	100.0	35	100.0	6	100.0	15	100.0

	MAPSE		Soc.Sci.& Pub.Svcs.		Adminis-tration		Stu.Pers. Services		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	12	46.2	8	29.6	2	25.0	5	62.5	55	39.6
One	7	26.9	12	44.4	2	25.0	1	12.5	41	29.5
Two to four	6	23.1	3	11.1	2	25.0	2	25.0	28	20.1
Five or more	1	3.8	4	14.8	2	25.0	0	0	15	10.8
Total	26	100.0	27	100.0	8	100.0	8	100.0	139	100.0

TABLE 16
NUMBER OF PROJECTS FOR DEVELOPING NEW COURSES OR PROGRAMS

	Bus.& Mgt Services		Comm. & the Arts		Instruc. Resources		Life Sciences	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	3	21.4	10	28.6	4	66.7	2	13.3
One	2	14.3	8	22.9	2	33.3	3	20.0
Two to four	7	50.0	11	31.4	0	0	9	60.0
Five or more	2	14.3	6	17.1	0	0	1	6.7
Total	14	100.0	35	100.0	6	100.0	15	100.0

	MAPSE		Soc.Sci.& Pub.Svcs.		Adminis-tration		Stu.Pers. Services		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	6	23.1	10	37.0	2	28.6	2	25.0	39	28.3
One	9	34.6	2	7.4	1	14.3	3	37.5	30	21.7
Two to four	9	34.6	11	40.7	2	28.6	1	12.5	50	36.2
Five or more	2	7.7	4	14.8	2	28.6	2	25.0	19	13.7
Total	26	100.0	27	100.0	7	100.0	8	100.0	138	100.0

TABLE 17
FREQUENCY OF USING VARIOUS TEACHING TECHNIQUES DURING PROFESSIONAL CAREER

	Bus.& Mgt Services (N=14)		Comm. & the Arts (N=35)		Instruc. Resources (N=6)		Life Sciences (N=15)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Team teaching	5	35.7	10	28.6	1	16.7	11	73.3
Visiting lecturers	9	64.3	19	54.3	1	16.7	12	80.0
Field trips	7	50.0	19	54.3	1	16.7	15	100.0
Teaching hardware[1]	14	100.0	24	68.6	3	50.0	15	100.0
Teaching software[2]	12	85.7	25	71.4	3	50.0	14	93.3

	MAPSE (N=26)		Soc.Sci.& Pub.Svcs. (N=27)		Adminis-tration (N=8)		Stu.Pers. Services (N=8)		Total (N=139)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Team teaching	4	15.4	10	37.0	3	37.5	3	37.5	47	33.8
Visiting lecturers	13	50.0	18	66.7	5	62.5	6	75.0	83	59.7
Field trips	16	61.5	12	44.4	2	25.0	5	62.5	77	55.4
Teaching hardware[1]	25	96.2	22	81.5	5	62.5	5	62.5	113	81.3
Teaching software[2]	25	96.2	18	66.7	5	62.5	4	50.0	106	76.3

[1] Includes audio-visuals, computer-aided instruction, demonstration models, etc.
[2] Includes prepared charts, illustrations, transparencies, etc.

TABLE 18
AREAS OF COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION SINCE 1967

	Bus.& Mgt Services (N=14)		Comm. & the Arts (N=35)		Instruc. Resources (N=6)		Life Sciences (N=15)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Professional consulting activities	10	71.4	6	17.1	0	0	6	40.0
Community action projects[1]	5	35.7	18	51.4	1	16.7	7	46.7
Appointed or elected offices	3	21.4	5	14.3	2	33.3	0	0
Others	5	35.7	5	14.3	0	0	4	26.7

	MAPSE (N=26)		Soc.Sci.& Pub.Svcs. (N=27)		Adminis-tration (N=8)		Stu.Pers. Services (N=8)		Total (N=139)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Professional consulting activities	6	23.1	7	25.9	2	25.0	0	0	37	26.6
Community action projects[1]	12	46.2	15	55.6	5	62.5	5	62.5	68	48.9
Appointed or elected offices	3	11.5	6	22.2	2	25.0	2	25.0	23	16.5
Others	7	26.9	5	18.5	2	25.0	0	0	28	20.1

[1] Includes fund-raising, civic improvement, political activity, etc.

TABLE 19
NUMBER OF JOURNAL SUBSCRIPTIONS

	Bus.& Mgt Services		Comm. & the Arts		Instruc. Resources		Life Sciences	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	0	0	6	17.1	2	33.3	1	6.7
1 to 5	11	78.6	28	80.0	4	66.7	12	80.0
6 or more	3	21.4	1	2.9	0	0	2	13.3
Total	14	100.0	35	100.0	6	100.0	15	100.0

	MAPSE		Soc.Sci.& Pub.Svcs.		Adminis-tration		Stu.Pers. Services		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	1	4.0	5	18.5	1	12.5	1	12.5	17	12.3
1 to 5	23	92.0	21	77.8	6	75.0	6	75.0	111	80.4
6 or more	1	4.0	1	3.7	1	12.5	1	12.5	10	7.2
Total	25	100.0	27	100.0	8	100.0	8	100.0	138	100.0

TABLE 20
NUMBER OF PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIPS

	Bus.& Mgt Services		Comm. & the Arts		Instruc. Resources		Life Sciences	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	3	21.4	7	20.0	1	16.7	4	26.7
One	2	14.3	8	22.9	2	33.3	1	6.7
Two	2	14.3	10	28.6	0	0	4	26.7
Three or more	7	50.0	10	28.6	3	50.0	6	40.0
Total	14	100.0	35	100.0	6	100.0	15	100.0

	MAPSE		Soc.Sci.& Pub.Svcs.		Adminis-tration		Stu.Pers. Services		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	1	3.8	8	29.6	0	0	4	50.0	28	20.1
One	12	46.2	2	7.4	1	12.5	0	0	28	20.1
Two	10	38.5	9	33.3	4	50.0	0	0	39	28.1
Three or more	3	11.5	8	29.6	3	37.5	4	50.0	44	31.7
Total	26	100.0	27	100.0	8	100.0	8	100.0	139	100.0

TABLE 21
ALL THINGS CONSIDERED, STUDENT DISSENT ON COLLEGE CAMPUSES HAS SERVED A CONSTRUCTION FUNCTION FOR BOTH STUDENTS AND FACULTY

	Strongly disagree		Mildly disagree		Neutral		Mildly agree		Strongly agree		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Division:											
Business and Mgmt. Services	1	7.1	3	21.4	2	14.3	8	57.1	0	0	14
Communication and the Arts	0	0	4	11.8	5	14.7	19	55.9	6	17.6	34
Instructional Resources	0	0	2	33.3	0	0	4	66.7	0	0	6
Life Sciences, Health Services, and Physical Education	0	0	3	21.4	2	14.3	8	57.1	1	7.1	14
Mathematics, Physical Science, and Engineering	2	7.7	11	42.3	1	3.8	12	46.2	0	0	26
Social Science and Public Services	0	0	3	11.1	1	3.7	12	44.4	11	40.7	27
Administration	0	0	0	0	4	50.0	4	50.0	0	0	8
Student Personnel Services	1	12.5	0	0	0	0	6	75.0	1	12.5	8
Age:											
Up to 29	1	2.2	7	15.6	6	13.3	22	48.9	9	20.0	45
30 to 39	2	4.7	9	20.9	5	11.6	23	53.5	4	9.3	43
40 to 49	0	0	4	14.8	2	7.4	18	66.7	3	11.1	27
50 and over	1	4.5	6	27.3	2	9.1	10	45.5	3	13.6	22
Previous residence:											
Moved into Penna. to take job at H.A.C.C.	0	0	6	11.1	7	12.9	30	55.6	11	20.4	54
Moved within Penna. to take job at H.A.C.C.	1	4.3	5	21.7	5	21.7	10	43.5	2	8.7	23
No residence change	3	5.0	15	25.0	3	5.0	33	55.0	6	10.0	60
Junior college graduate course:											
Completed graduate course on junior college	0	0	5	21.7	2	8.7	16	69.6	0	0	23
No graduate course on junior college	4	3.6	20	17.9	13	11.6	56	50.0	19	16.9	112
Highest educational level:											
Bachelor's degree or less	1	4.0	7	28.0	1	4.0	14	56.0	2	8.0	25
Master's degree	3	3.1	17	17.7	11	11.5	50	52.1	15	15.6	96
Doctorate degree or advanced specialist	0	0	2	12.5	3	18.8	9	56.3	2	12.5	16
Academic rank:											
Instructor	1	2.2	4	8.9	5	11.1	26	57.8	9	20.0	45
Assistant professor	2	3.4	15	25.4	5	8.5	30	50.8	7	11.9	59
Associate professor	1	5.6	4	22.2	3	16.7	8	44.4	2	11.1	18
Professor	0	0	3	20.0	2	13.3	9	60.0	1	6.7	15
Years teaching experience:											
5 or less	2	3.2	12	19.4	7	11.3	30	48.4	11	17.7	62
6 or more	2	2.7	14	18.7	8	10.7	43	57.3	8	10.7	75
Total	4	2.9	26	19.0	15	10.9	73	53.3	19	13.9	137

TABLE 22
THE ONLY LIMITATIONS ON STUDENT DRESS SHOULD BE THOSE SPECIFICALLY RELATED TO MATTERS OF HYGIENE AND SAFETY

	Strongly disagree		Mildly disagree		Neutral		Mildly agree		Strongly agree		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Division:											
Business and Mgmt. Services	4	28.6	2	14.3	2	14.3	2	14.3	4	28.6	14
Communication and the Arts	0	0	3	8.6	3	8.6	10	28.6	19	54.3	35
Instructional Resources	0	0	3	50.0	0	0	2	33.3	1	16.7	6
Life Sciences, Health Services, and Physical Education	1	6.7	1	6.7	1	6.7	6	40.0	6	40.0	15
Mathematics, Physical Science, and Engineering	0	0	9	34.6	2	7.7	9	34.6	6	23.1	26
Social Science and Public Services	0	0	2	7.4	1	3.7	7	25.9	17	62.9	27
Administration	0	0	2	25.0	1	12.5	1	12.5	4	50.0	8
Student Personnel Services	0	0	3	37.5	1	12.5	1	12.5	3	37.5	8
Age:											
Up to 29	0	0	7	14.9	3	6.4	9	19.1	28	59.6	47
30 to 39	1	2.3	7	16.3	3	6.9	15	34.9	17	39.5	43
40 to 49	4	14.8	7	25.9	1	3.7	10	37.0	5	18.5	27
50 and over	0	0	4	18.2	4	18.2	4	18.2	10	45.5	22
Previous residence:											
Moved into Penna. to take job at H.A.C.C.	3	5.5	6	10.9	4	7.3	17	30.9	25	45.5	55
Moved within Penna. to take job at H.A.C.C.	1	4.3	4	17.4	1	4.3	7	30.4	10	43.5	23
No residence change	1	1.6	15	24.6	6	9.8	14	22.9	25	40.9	61
Junior college graduate course:											
Completed graduate course on junior college	2	8.7	4	17.4	3	13.0	7	30.4	7	30.4	23
No graduate course on junior college	3	2.6	21	18.4	8	7.0	30	26.3	52	45.6	114
Highest educational level:											
Bachelor's degree or less	1	4.0	6	24.0	2	8.0	7	28.0	9	36.0	25
Master's degree	4	4.1	19	19.4	6	6.1	22	22.4	47	47.9	98
Doctorate degree or advanced specialist	0	0	0	0	3	18.8	9	56.3	4	25.0	16
Academic rank:											
Instructor	0	0	8	17.4	3	6.5	12	26.1	23	50.0	46
Assistant professor	2	3.3	10	16.7	4	6.7	17	28.3	27	45.0	60
Associate professor	1	5.6	5	27.8	2	11.1	6	33.3	4	22.2	18
Professor	2	13.3	2	13.3	2	13.3	3	20.0	6	40.0	15
Years teaching experience:											
5 or less	1	1.6	12	19.0	4	6.3	12	19.0	34	53.9	63
6 or more	4	5.3	13	17.1	7	9.2	26	34.2	26	34.2	76
Total	5	3.6	25	18.0	11	7.9	38	27.3	60	43.2	139

TABLE 23
STUDENTS SHOULD BE ENCOURAGED TO PARTICIPATE ON VIRTUALLY ALL COLLEGE COMMITTEES

	Strongly disagree		Mildly disagree		Neutral		Mildly agree		Strongly agree		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Division:											
Business and Mgmt. Services	2	14.3	2	14.3	2	14.3	5	35.7	3	21.4	14
Communication and the Arts	1	2.9	3	8.6	6	17.1	13	37.1	12	34.3	35
Instructional Resources	1	16.7	3	50.0	0	0	1	16.7	1	16.7	6
Life Sciences, Health Services, and Physical Education	3	20.0	1	6.7	2	13.3	5	33.3	4	26.7	15
Mathematics, Physical Science, and Engineering	2	7.7	5	19.2	3	11.5	13	50.0	3	11.5	26
Social Science and Public Services	0	0	2	7.4	2	7.4	4	14.8	19	70.4	27
Administration	1	12.5	1	12.5	0	0	4	50.0	2	25.0	8
Student Personnel Services	0	0	2	25.0	0	0	2	25.0	4	50.0	8
Age:											
Up to 29	1	2.1	2	4.3	6	12.8	16	34.0	22	46.8	47
30 to 39	4	9.3	9	20.9	3	6.9	15	34.9	12	27.9	43
40 to 49	4	14.8	3	11.1	5	18.5	7	25.9	8	29.6	27
50 and over	1	4.5	5	22.7	1	4.5	9	40.9	6	27.3	22
Previous residence:											
Moved into Penna. to take job at H.A.C.C.	4	7.3	2	3.6	7	12.7	17	30.9	25	45.5	55
Moved within Penna. to take job at H.A.C.C.	3	13.0	4	17.4	2	8.7	8	34.8	6	26.1	23
No residence change	3	4.9	13	21.3	6	9.8	22	36.1	17	27.9	61
Junior college graduate course:											
Completed graduate course on junior college	0	0	3	13.0	2	8.7	8	34.8	10	43.5	23
No graduate course on junior college	10	8.8	16	14.0	12	10.5	38	33.3	38	33.3	114
Highest educational level:											
Bachelor's degree or less	2	8.0	4	16.0	2	8.0	10	40.0	7	28.0	25
Master's degree	7	7.1	14	14.3	12	12.2	30	30.6	35	35.7	98
Doctorate degree or advanced specialist	1	6.3	1	6.3	1	6.3	7	43.8	6	37.5	16
Academic rank:											
Instructor	0	0	5	10.9	4	8.7	16	34.8	21	45.7	46
Assistant professor	8	13.3	7	11.7	8	13.3	19	31.7	18	30.0	60
Associate professor	1	5.6	3	16.7	3	16.7	6	33.3	5	27.8	18
Professor	1	6.7	4	26.7	0	0	6	40.0	4	26.7	15
Years teaching experience:											
5 or less	2	3.2	5	7.9	7	11.1	24	38.1	25	39.7	63
6 or more	8	10.5	14	18.4	8	10.5	23	30.3	23	30.3	76
Total	10	7.2	19	13.7	15	10.8	47	33.8	48	34.5	139

TABLE 24
ALL THINGS BEING EQUAL, COLLEGE ADMINISTRATORS ARE IN THE BEST POSSIBLE POSITION TO MAKE DECISIONS ABOUT COLLEGE POLICY

	Strongly disagree		Mildly disagree		Neutral		Mildly agree		Strongly agree		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Division:											
Business and Mgmt. Services	0	0	3	21.4	3	21.4	6	42.9	2	14.3	14
Communication and the Arts	4	11.4	13	37.1	5	14.3	12	34.3	1	2.9	35
Instructional Resources	0	0	1	16.7	1	16.7	2	33.3	2	33.3	6
Life Sciences, Health Services, and Physical Education	2	13.3	3	20.0	3	20.0	5	33.3	2	13.3	15
Mathematics, Physical Science, and Engineering	2	7.7	7	26.9	3	11.5	11	42.3	3	11.5	26
Social Science and Public Services	8	29.6	10	37.0	4	14.8	4	14.8	1	3.7	27
Administration	1	12.5	1	12.5	1	12.5	3	37.5	2	25.0	8
Student Personnel Services	2	25.0	2	25.0	1	12.5	3	37.5	0	0	8
Age:											
Up to 29	5	10.6	20	42.6	10	21.3	11	23.4	1	2.1	47
30 to 39	8	18.6	9	20.9	5	11.6	18	41.9	3	6.9	43
40 to 49	4	14.8	4	14.8	2	7.4	14	51.9	3	11.1	27
50 and over	2	9.1	7	31.8	4	18.2	3	13.6	6	27.3	22
Previous residence:											
Moved into Penna. to take job at H.A.C.C.	8	14.5	20	36.4	8	14.5	17	30.9	2	3.6	55
Moved within Penna. to take job at H.A.C.C.	4	17.4	7	30.4	4	17.4	7	30.4	1	4.3	23
No residence change	7	11.5	13	21.3	9	14.8	22	36.1	10	16.4	61
Junior college graduate course:											
Completed graduate course on junior college	6	26.1	8	34.8	4	17.4	2	8.7	3	13.0	23
No graduate course on junior college	13	11.4	31	27.2	17	14.9	44	38.6	9	7.9	114
Highest educational level:											
Bachelor's degree or less	1	4.0	6	24.0	5	20.0	7	28.0	6	24.0	25
Master's degree	14	14.3	30	30.6	13	13.3	35	35.7	6	6.1	98
Doctorate degree or advanced specialist	4	25.0	4	25.0	3	18.8	4	25.0	1	6.3	16
Academic rank:											
Instructor	3	6.5	18	39.1	10	21.7	12	26.1	3	6.5	46
Assistant professor	13	21.7	14	23.3	7	11.7	22	36.7	4	6.7	60
Associate professor	2	11.1	5	27.8	2	11.1	7	38.9	2	11.1	18
Professor	1	6.7	3	20.0	2	13.3	5	33.3	4	26.7	15
Years teaching experience:											
5 or less	7	11.1	22	34.9	11	17.5	19	30.2	4	6.3	63
6 or more	12	15.8	18	23.7	10	13.2	27	35.5	9	11.8	76
Total	19	13.7	40	28.8	21	15.1	46	33.1	13	9.4	139

TABLE 25
THE PRESENT METHOD OF EVALUATING STUDENT PERFORMANCE THROUGH LETTER OR NUMERICAL GRADES IS PROBABLY THE BEST ONE CURRENTLY AVAILABLE

	Strongly disagree		Mildly disagree		Neutral		Mildly agree		Strongly agree		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Division:											
Business and Mgmt. Services	1	12.5	1	12.5	1	12.5	1	12.5	4	50.0	8
Communication and the Arts	6	17.1	8	22.9	3	8.6	16	45.7	2	5.7	35
Instructional Resources	1	16.7	1	16.7	0	0	4	66.7	0	0	6
Life Sciences, Health Services, and Physical Education	1	7.1	0	0	4	28.6	6	42.9	3	21.4	14
Mathematics, Physical Science, and Engineering	2	8.0	3	12.0	3	12.0	10	40.0	7	28.0	25
Social Science and Public Services	7	25.9	6	22.2	6	22.2	7	25.9	1	3.7	27
Administration	0	0	1	12.5	2	25.0	4	50.0	1	12.5	8
Student Personnel Services	2	25.0	0	0	2	25.0	2	25.0	2	25.0	8
Age:											
Up to 29	9	19.1	8	17.0	9	19.1	18	38.3	3	6.4	47
30 to 39	5	11.6	6	13.9	6	13.9	18	41.9	8	18.6	43
40 to 49	4	15.4	5	19.2	2	7.7	9	34.6	6	23.1	26
50 and over	2	9.5	1	4.8	4	19.0	11	52.4	3	14.3	21
Previous residence:											
Moved into Penna. to take job at H.A.C.C.	12	22.2	10	18.5	9	16.7	19	35.2	4	7.4	54
Moved within Penna. to take job at H.A.C.C.	3	13.0	4	17.4	2	8.7	10	43.5	4	17.4	23
No residence change	5	8.3	6	10.0	10	16.7	27	45.0	12	20.0	60
Junior college graduate course:											
Completed graduate course on junior college	7	30.4	1	4.3	5	21.7	10	43.5	0	0	23
No graduate course on junior college	13	11.6	19	16.9	16	14.3	46	41.1	18	16.1	112
Highest educational level:											
Bachelor's degree or less	2	8.3	2	8.3	2	8.3	11	45.8	7	29.2	24
Master's degree	16	16.5	14	14.4	16	16.5	40	41.2	11	11.3	97
Doctorate degree or advanced specialist	2	12.5	4	25.0	3	18.8	5	31.3	2	12.5	16
Academic rank:											
Instructor	7	15.2	8	17.4	7	15.2	20	43.5	4	8.7	46
Assistant professor	7	12.1	10	17.2	9	15.5	23	39.7	9	15.5	58
Associate professor	4	22.2	1	5.6	4	22.2	5	27.8	4	22.2	18
Professor	2	13.3	1	6.7	1	6.7	8	53.3	3	20.0	15
Years teaching experience:											
5 or less	8	12.9	9	14.5	10	16.1	26	41.9	9	14.5	62
6 or more	12	16.0	11	14.7	11	14.7	30	40.0	11	14.7	75
Total	20	14.6	20	14.6	21	15.3	56	40.9	20	14.6	137

TABLE 26
WITH RESPECT TO SPECIAL STUDENT SERVICES FOR DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS, THE ADMINISTRATION SHOULD SEEK OUT SUCH STUDENTS WITHIN THE COMMUNITY, EVEN IF MONEY AND PROGRAMS MUST BE SPECIALLY SOUGHT TO MEET THE NEED

	Strongly disagree		Mildly disagree		Neutral		Mildly agree		Strongly agree		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Division:											
Business and Mgmt. Services	0	0	0	0	3	21.4	6	42.9	5	35.7	14
Communication and the Arts	0	0	2	5.7	7	20.0	11	31.4	15	42.9	35
Instructional Resources	0	0	1	16.7	0	0	3	50.0	2	33.3	6
Life Sciences, Health Services,	0	0	0	0	1	7.1	9	64.3	4	28.6	14
Mathematics, Physical Science, and Engineering	0	0	5	19.2	2	7.7	10	38.5	9	34.6	26
Social Science and Public Services	0	0	3	11.1	2	7.4	8	29.6	14	51.9	27
Administration	0	0	1	12.5	0	0	3	37.5	4	50.0	8
Student Personnel Services	0	0	0	0	1	12.5	3	37.5	4	50.0	8
Age:											
Up to 29	0	0	2	4.3	3	6.4	21	44.7	21	44.7	47
30 to 39	0	0	6	13.9	9	20.9	11	25.6	17	39.5	43
40 to 49	0	0	2	7.4	3	11.1	13	48.1	9	33.3	27
50 and over	0	0	2	9.5	1	4.8	8	38.1	10	47.6	21
Previous residence:											
Moved into Penna. to take job at H.A.C.C.	0	0	2	3.7	6	11.1	17	31.5	29	53.7	54
Moved within Penna. to take job at H.A.C.C.	0	0	3	13.0	2	8.7	12	52.2	6	26.1	23
No residence change	0	0	7	11.5	8	13.1	24	39.3	22	36.1	61
Junior college graduate course:											
Completed graduate course on junior college	0	0	1	4.5	2	9.1	7	31.8	12	54.5	22
No graduate course on junior college	0	0	11	9.6	14	12.3	46	40.4	43	37.7	114
Highest educational level:											
Bachelor's degree or less	0	0	3	12.0	2	8.0	9	36.0	11	44.0	25
Master's degree	0	0	8	8.2	13	13.3	39	39.8	38	38.8	98
Doctorate degree or advanced specialist	0	0	1	6.7	1	6.7	5	33.3	8	53.3	15
Academic rank:											
Instructor	0	0	2	4.3	5	10.9	18	39.1	21	45.7	46
Assistant professor	0	0	8	13.3	8	13.3	21	35.0	23	38.3	60
Associate professor	0	0	2	11.8	2	11.8	7	41.2	6	35.3	17
Professor	0	0	0	0	1	6.7	7	46.7	7	46.7	15
Years teaching experience:											
5 or less	0	0	4	6.3	6	9.5	25	39.7	28	44.4	63
6 or more	0	0	8	10.7	10	13.3	28	37.3	29	38.7	75
Total	0	0	12	8.7	16	11.6	53	38.4	57	41.3	138

TABLE 27
THE COLLEGE SHOULD PROVIDE COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP IN SUCH AREAS OF SOCIAL CHANGE AS CIVIL RIGHTS, HOUSING, EQUAL EMPLOYMENT, AND SOCIAL SERVICES

	Strongly disagree		Mildly disagree		Neutral		Mildly agree		Strongly agree		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Division:											
Business and Mgmt. Services	2	14.3	2	14.3	2	14.3	3	21.4	5	35.7	14
Communication and the Arts	1	2.9	4	11.4	2	5.7	12	34.3	16	45.7	35
Instructional Resources	0	0	0	0	1	16.7	4	66.7	1	16.7	6
Life Sciences, Health Services, and Physical Education	0	0	1	6.7	5	33.3	4	26.7	5	33.3	15
Mathematics, Physical Science, and Engineering	3	12.0	3	12.0	4	16.0	10	40.0	5	20.0	25
Social Science and Public Services	0	0	5	18.5	3	11.1	9	33.3	10	37.0	27
Administration	0	0	0	0	2	25.0	6	75.0	0	0	8
Student Personnel Services	1	12.5	3	37.5	0	0	1	12.5	3	37.5	8
Age:											
Up to 29	2	4.3	4	8.5	8	[illegible]	12	25.5	21	44.7	47
30 to 39	3	6.9	7	16.3	6	13.[illegible]	18	41.9	9	20.9	43
40 to 49	0	0	4	14.8	2	7.4	11	40.7	10	37.0	27
50 and over	2	9.5	3	14.3	3	14.3	8	38.1	5	23.8	21
Previous residence:											
Moved into Penna. to take job at H.A.C.C.	1	1.8	5	9.1	6	10.9	19	34.5	24	43.6	55
Moved within Penna. to take job at H.A.C.C.	2	8.7	5	21.7	5	21.7	7	30.4	4	17.4	23
No residence change	4	6.7	8	13.3	8	13.3	23	38.3	17	28.3	60
Junior college graduate course:											
Completed graduate course on junior college	1	4.3	3	13.0	3	13.0	6	26.1	10	43.5	23
No graduate course on junior college	5	4.4	15	13.3	16	14.2	43	38.1	34	30.1	113
Highest educational level:											
Bachelor's degree or less	1	4.2	3	12.5	4	16.7	7	29.2	9	37.5	24
Master's degree	6	6.1	14	14.3	11	11.2	36	36.7	31	31.6	98
Doctorate degree or advanced specialist	0	0	1	6.3	4	25.0	6	37.5	5	31.3	16
Academic rank:											
Instructor	2	4.3	7	15.2	3	6.5	10	21.7	24	52.2	46
Assistant professor	3	5.1	8	13.6	12	20.3	21	35.6	15	25.4	59
Associate professor	1	5.6	3	16.7	2	11.1	10	55.6	2	11.1	18
Professor	1	6.7	0	0	2	13.3	8	53.3	4	26.7	15
Years teaching experience:											
5 or less	3	4.8	8	12.9	10	16.1	15	24.2	26	41.9	62
6 or more	4	5.3	10	13.2	9	11.8	34	44.7	19	25.0	76
Total	7	5.1	18	13.0	19	13.8	49	35.5	45	32.6	138

TABLE 28
NON-DEGREE PROGRAMS IN CONTINUING EDUCATION SHOULD BE EXPANDED TO MEET THE DESIRES OF THE COMMUNITY

	Strongly disagree		Mildly disagree		Neutral		Mildly agree		Strongly agree		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Division:											
Business and Mgmt. Services	0	0	0	0	1	7.1	2	14.3	11	78.6	14
Communication and the Arts	0	0	1	2.9	0	0	10	28.6	24	68.6	35
Instructional Resources	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	33.3	4	66.7	6
Life Sciences, Health Services, and Physical Education	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	26.7	11	73.3	15
Mathematics, Physical Science, and Engineering	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	11.5	23	88.5	26
Social Science and Public Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	14.8	23	85.2	27
Administration	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	100.0	8
Student Personnel Services	0	0	0	0	1	12.5	1	12.5	6	75.0	8
Age:											
Up to 29	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	14.9	40	85.1	47
30 to 39	0	0	1	2.3	2	4.7	11	25.6	29	67.4	43
40 to 49	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	22.2	21	77.8	27
50 and over	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	9.1	20	90.9	22
Previous residence:											
Moved into Penna. to take job at H.A.C.C.	0	0	1	1.8	0	0	8	14.5	46	83.6	55
Moved within Penna. to take job at H.A.C.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	26.1	17	73.9	23
No residence change	0	0	0	0	2	3.3	12	19.7	47	77.0	61
Junior college graduate course:											
Completed graduate course on junior college	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	13.0	20	87.0	23
No graduate course on junior college	0	0	1	.9	2	1.8	23	20.2	88	77.2	114
Highest educational level:											
Bachelor's degree or less	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	20.0	20	80.0	25
Master's degree	0	0	1	1.0	2	2.0	19	19.4	76	77.6	98
Doctorate degree or advanced specialist	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	12.5	14	87.5	16
Academic rank:											
Instructor	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	19.6	37	80.4	46
Assistant professor	0	0	1	1.7	2	3.3	11	18.3	46	76.7	60
Associate professor	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	22.2	14	77.8	18
Professor	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	13.3	13	86.7	15
Years teaching experience:											
5 or less	0	0	0	0	1	1.6	10	15.9	52	82.5	63
6 or more	0	0	1	1.3	1	1.3	16	21.1	58	76.3	76
Total	0	0	1	.7	2	1.4	26	18.7	110	79.1	139

TABLE 29
THE GOALS OF EDUCATION FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE STUDENTS SHOULD FOCUS PRIMARILY UPON PREPARATION FOR EMPLOYMENT AND AMERICAN CULTURE AND TRADITIONS

	Strongly disagree		Mildly disagree		Neutral		Mildly agree		Strongly agree		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Division:											
Business and Mgmt. Services	0	0	1	7.1	1	7.1	6	42.9	6	42.9	14
Communication and the Arts	0	0	7	20.0	7	20.0	15	42.9	6	17.1	35
Instructional Resources	0	0	1	16.7	0	0	3	50.0	2	33.3	6
Life Sciences, Health Services, and Physical Education	0	0	2	13.3	1	6.7	9	60.0	3	20.0	15
Mathematics, Physical Science, and Engineering	1	4.0	2	8.0	2	8.0	12	48.0	8	32.0	25
Social Science and Public Services	3	11.1	9	33.3	3	11.1	8	29.6	4	14.8	27
Administration	0	0	2	25.0	1	12.5	4	50.0	1	12.5	8
Student Personnel Services	2	28.6	2	28.6	0	0	2	28.6	1	14.3	7
Age:											
Up to 29	2	4.3	10	21.3	7	14.9	20	42.6	8	17.0	47
30 to 39	2	4.7	8	18.6	6	14.0	20	46.5	7	16.3	43
40 to 49	0	0	4	16.0	1	4.0	10	40.0	10	40.0	25
50 and over	2	9.1	4	18.2	1	4.5	9	40.9	6	27.3	22
Previous residence:											
Moved into Penna. to take job at H.A.C.C.	4	7.3	13	23.6	8	14.5	19	34.5	11	20.0	55
Moved within Penna. to take job at H.A.C.C.	0	0	3	13.0	2	8.7	13	56.5	5	21.7	23
No residence change	2	3.4	10	16.9	5	8.5	27	45.8	15	25.4	59
Junior college graduate course:											
Completed graduate course on junior college	2	8.7	5	21.7	1	4.3	7	30.4	8	34.8	23
No graduate course on junior college	4	3.6	21	18.8	14	12.5	52	46.4	21	18.8	112
Highest educational level:											
Bachelor's degree or less	0	0	1	4.2	2	8.3	14	58.3	7	29.2	24
Master's degree	6	6.2	21	21.6	11	11.3	38	39.2	21	21.6	97
Doctorate degree or advanced specialist	0	0	4	25.0	2	12.5	7	43.8	3	18.8	16
Academic rank:											
Instructor	3	6.5	8	17.4	5	10.9	22	47.8	8	17.4	46
Assistant professor	1	1.7	10	16.9	8	13.6	24	40.7	16	27.1	59
Associate professor	2	11.8	5	29.4	1	5.9	7	41.2	2	11.8	17
Professor	0	0	3	20.0	1	6.7	6	40.0	5	33.3	15
Years teaching experience:											
5 or less	3	4.9	11	18.0	7	11.5	28	45.9	12	19.7	61
6 or more	3	3.9	15	19.7	8	10.5	31	40.8	19	25.0	76
Total	6	4.4	26	19.0	15	10.9	59	43.1	31	22.6	137

TABLE 30
THE ROLE OF THE INSTRUCTOR AT THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE SHOULD INCLUDE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ABOUT THE TECHNIQUES AND OUTCOMES OF TEACHING

	Strongly disagree		Mildly disagree		Neutral		Mildly agree		Strongly agree		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Division:											
Business and Mgmt. Services	0	0	2	14.3	3	21.4	4	28.6	5	35.7	14
Communication and the Arts	0	0	0	0	3	8.6	16	45.7	16	45.7	35
Instructional Resources	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	50.0	3	50.0	6
Life Sciences, Health Services, and Physical Education	0	0	2	13.3	1	6.7	5	33.3	7	46.7	15
Mathematics, Physical Science, and Engineering	0	0	3	11.5	3	11.5	10	38.5	10	38.5	26
Social Science and Public Services	1	3.8	1	3.8	4	15.4	11	42.3	9	34.6	26
Administration	0	0	2	25.0	2	25.0	3	37.5	1	12.5	8
Student Personnel Services	0	0	1	12.5	0	0	4	50.0	3	37.5	8
Age:											
Up to 29	0	0	2	4.3	7	15.2	14	30.4	23	50.0	46
30 to 39	1	2.3	3	7.0	5	11.6	17	39.5	17	39.5	43
40 to 49	0	0	4	14.8	2	7.4	12	44.4	9	33.3	27
50 and over	0	0	2	9.1	2	9.1	13	59.1	5	22.7	22
Previous residence:											
Moved into Penna. to take job at H.A.C.C.	0	0	8	14.5	5	9.1	23	41.8	19	34.5	55
Moved within Penna. to take job at H.A.C.C.	1	4.3	0	0	2	8.7	11	47.8	9	39.1	23
No residence change	0	0	3	5.0	9	15.0	22	36.7	26	43.3	60
Junior college graduate course:											
Completed graduate course on junior college	1	4.3	2	8.7	0	0	11	47.8	9	39.1	23
No graduate course on junior college	0	0	9	8.0	16	14.2	45	39.8	43	38.1	113
Highest educational level:											
Bachelor's degree or less	0	0	0	0	3	12.0	11	44.0	11	44.0	25
Master's degree	0	0	10	10.3	12	12.4	38	39.2	37	38.1	97
Doctorate degree or advanced specialist	1	6.3	1	6.3	1	6.3	7	43.8	6	37.5	16
Academic rank:											
Instructor	0	0	1	2.2	6	13.0	16	34.8	23	50.0	46
Assistant professor	1	1.7	6	10.2	6	10.2	23	39.0	23	39.0	59
Associate professor	0	0	2	11.1	3	16.7	9	50.0	4	22.2	18
Professor	0	0	2	13.3	1	6.7	8	53.3	4	26.7	15
Years teaching experience:											
5 or less	0	0	2	3.2	11	17.7	21	33.9	28	45.2	62
6 or more	1	1.3	9	11.8	5	6.6	35	46.1	26	34.2	76
Total	1	.7	11	8.0	16	11.6	56	40.6	54	39.1	138

TABLE 31
THERE IS ADEQUATE PROFESSIONAL SUPPORT (RELEASED TIME, PROFESSIONAL CONSULTATION, ETC.) FOR INSTRUCTIONAL RESEARCH AT H.A.C.C.

	Strongly disagree		Mildly disagree		Neutral		Mildly agree		Strongly agree		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Division:											
Business and Mgmt. Services	2	14.3	5	35.7	1	7.1	4	28.6	2	14.3	14
Communication and the Arts	3	9.1	2	6.1	18	54.5	8	24.2	2	6.1	33
Instructional Resources	0	0	1	16.7	3	50.0	2	33.3	0	0	6
Life Sciences, Health Services, and Physical Education	0	0	4	26.7	6	40.0	2	13.3	3	20.0	15
Mathematics, Physical Science, and Engineering	2	7.7	8	30.8	8	30.8	5	19.2	3	11.5	26
Social Science and Public Services	2	8.3	6	25.0	9	37.5	6	25.0	1	4.2	24
Administration	0	0	1	12.5	3	37.5	2	25.0	2	25.0	8
Student Personnel Services	1	12.5	2	25.0	5	62.5	0	0	0	0	8
Age:											
Up to 29	1	2.3	11	25.6	19	44.2	8	18.6	4	9.3	43
30 to 39	6	14.3	8	19.0	15	35.7	10	23.8	3	7.1	42
40 to 49	3	11.1	6	22.2	9	33.3	8	29.6	1	3.7	27
50 and over	0	0	4	18.2	10	45.5	3	13.6	5	22.7	22
Previous residence:											
Moved into Penna. to take job at H.A.C.C.	2	3.8	15	28.8	21	40.4	11	21.2	3	5.8	52
Moved within Penna. to take job at H.A.C.C.	2	9.1	6	27.3	7	31.8	4	18.2	3	13.6	22
No residence change	6	10.0	8	13.3	25	41.7	14	23.3	7	11.7	60
Junior college graduate course:											
Completed graduate course on junior college	4	17.4	6	26.1	6	26.1	4	17.4	3	13.0	23
No graduate course on junior college	6	5.5	23	21.1	47	43.1	25	22.9	8	7.3	109
Highest educational level:											
Bachelor's degree or less	2	8.0	3	12.0	13	52.0	4	16.0	3	12.0	25
Master's degree	6	6.5	22	23.7	32	34.4	24	25.8	9	9.7	93
Doctorate degree or advanced specialist	2	12.5	4	25.0	8	50.0	1	6.3	1	6.3	16
Academic rank:											
Instructor	3	7.3	6	14.6	23	56.1	7	17.1	2	4.9	41
Assistant professor	6	10.0	14	23.3	19	31.7	14	23.3	7	11.7	60
Associate professor	0	0	5	27.8	6	33.3	6	33.3	1	5.6	18
Professor	1	6.7	4	26.7	5	33.3	2	13.3	3	20.0	15
Years teaching experience:											
5 or less	3	5.1	12	20.3	25	42.4	14	23.7	5	8.5	59
6 or more	7	9.3	17	22.7	28	37.3	15	20.0	8	10.7	75
Total	10	7.5	29	21.6	53	39.6	29	21.6	13	9.7	134

TABLE 32
NOTHING IN MY PAST EDUCATION OR EXPERIENCE PREPARED ME FOR INSTRUCTIONAL RESEARCH AS NOTED IN TABLES 30 AND 31

	Strongly disagree		Mildly disagree		Neutral		Mildly agree		Strongly agree		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Division:											
Business and Mgmt. Services	2	14.3	5	35.7	5	35.7	2	14.3	0	0	14
Communication and the Arts	10	29.4	10	29.4	9	26.5	3	8.8	2	5.9	34
Instructional Resources	0	0	0	0	2	33.3	2	33.3	2	33.3	6
Life Sciences, Health Services, and Physical Education	4	26.7	5	33.3	1	6.7	3	20.0	2	13.3	15
Mathematics, Physical Science, and Engineering	8	30.7	6	23.1	2	7.7	8	30.8	2	7.7	26
Social Science and Public Services	9	33.3	9	33.3	5	18.5	3	11.1	1	3.7	27
Administration	2	25.0	0	0	1	12.5	4	50.0	1	12.5	8
Student Personnel Services	2	25.0	2	25.0	2	25.0	2	25.0	0	0	8
Age:											
Up to 29	8	17.0	16	34.0	8	17.0	12	25.5	3	6.4	47
30 to 39	17	39.5	10	23.3	8	18.6	6	14.0	2	4.7	43
40 to 49	8	29.6	6	22.2	4	14.8	7	25.9	2	7.4	27
50 and over	4	19.0	5	23.8	7	33.3	2	9.5	3	14.3	21
Previous residence:											
Moved into Penna. to take job at H.A.C.C.	13	23.6	13	23.6	12	21.8	13	23.6	4	7.3	55
Moved within Penna. to take job at H.A.C.C.	4	17.4	9	39.1	5	21.7	4	17.4	1	4.3	23
No residence change	20	33.3	15	25.0	10	16.7	10	16.7	5	8.3	60
Junior college graduate course:											
Completed graduate course on junior college	8	34.8	6	26.1	5	21.7	4	17.4	0	0	23
No graduate course on junior college	29	25.4	31	27.2	21	18.4	23	20.2	10	8.8	114
Highest educational level:											
Bachelor's degree or less	8	33.3	3	12.5	7	29.2	4	16.7	2	8.3	24
Master's degree	23	23.5	30	30.6	18	18.4	19	19.4	8	8.2	98
Doctorate degree or advanced specialist	6	37.5	4	25.0	2	12.5	4	25.0	0	0	16
Academic rank:											
Instructor	13	28.9	13	28.9	9	20.0	7	15.6	3	6.7	45
Assistant professor	18	30.0	14	23.3	10	16.7	13	21.7	5	8.3	60
Associate professor	4	22.2	7	38.9	2	11.1	4	22.2	1	5.6	18
Professor	2	13.3	3	20.0	6	40.0	3	20.0	1	6.7	15
Years teaching experience:											
5 or less	16	25.4	16	25.4	13	20.6	13	20.6	5	7.9	63
6 or more	21	28.0	21	28.0	14	18.7	14	18.7	5	6.7	75
Total	37	26.8	37	26.8	27	19.6	27	19.6	10	7.2	138